

**NOT TO BE PUBLISHED IN OFFICIAL REPORTS**

California Rules of Court, rule 8.1115(a), prohibits courts and parties from citing or relying on opinions not certified for publication or ordered published, except as specified by rule 8.1115(b). This opinion has not been certified for publication or ordered published for purposes of rule 8.1115.

COURT OF APPEAL, FOURTH APPELLATE DISTRICT

DIVISION ONE

STATE OF CALIFORNIA

THE PEOPLE,

Plaintiff and Respondent,

v.

KAREN MCKNIGHT,

Defendant and Appellant.

D049408

(Super. Ct. No. SCD195081)

APPEAL from a judgment of the Superior Court of San Diego County, Christine V. Pate, Judge. Affirmed.

Karen McKnight entered a negotiated guilty plea to forgery of a check. (Pen. Code, § 470, subd. (d).) The court suspended imposition of sentence and placed her on three years' probation. At a restitution hearing, the court ordered McKnight to pay \$575 victim restitution. The record does not include a certificate of probable cause. (Cal. Rules of Court, rule 8.304(b).)

## FACTS

Viewing the record in the light most favorable to the judgment below (*People v. Johnson* (1980) 26 Cal.3d 557, 576), the following occurred. On November 17, 2005, McKnight tried to cash an \$80 check at Washington Mutual Bank on 30th Street. The bank teller determined the check had been stolen. McKnight was arrested.

At the restitution hearing, Leslie Gill testified that her checkbook was stolen from her car. She testified that while she was earning \$23 an hour, she spent approximately 25 hours contacting and waiting for police, making telephone calls to creditors, and arranging for fraud protection on her account. She testified that she spent 12 hours coming to court while she was earning \$18 an hour, and that the missing checkbook cover was worth \$50. The court found \$115 was the reasonable value of her loss seeking fraud protection, \$180 for lost wages for the time coming to court, \$230 for lost wages for the time spent contacting and talking with police, and \$50 for the checkbook cover.

## DISCUSSION

Appointed appellate counsel has filed a brief setting forth the evidence in the superior court. Counsel presents no argument for reversal but asks this court to review the record for error as mandated by *People v. Wende* (1979) 25 Cal.3d 436. Pursuant to *Anders v. California* (1967) 386 U.S. 738, counsel refers to as possible but not arguable issues: (1) whether a rational relationship exists between the amount of restitution and the victim's loss; and (2) whether there is sufficient evidence to show the victim's loss was caused by McKnight's crime.

We granted McKnight permission to file a brief on her own behalf. She has not responded. A review of the entire record pursuant to *People v. Wende, supra*, 25 Cal.3d 436, including the possible issues referred to pursuant to *Anders v. California, supra*, 386 U.S. 738, has disclosed no reasonably arguable appellate issue. Competent counsel has represented McKnight on this appeal.

#### DISPOSITION

The judgment is affirmed.

---

McDONALD, J.

WE CONCUR:

---

HUFFMAN, Acting P. J.

---

O'ROURKE, J.